

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

At present, claims 26-35 and 52-54 are pending in the application and currently stand rejected. Based on the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the amendment filed on March 17, 2009 under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) for introducing new matter. This objection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner contends that new claim 54 which requires that the center opening of the roll be reduced until substantially flat is not supported by the specification as originally filed. The Applicant respectfully submits that page 3, line 16 through page 4, line 4 discusses problems with coreless rolls that include the "total reduction of the center-opening" resulting from forming the roll and/or as a result of handling/shipping. FIG. 1 shows such a total reduction with the center opening being substantially flat albeit without a center projection.

The present invention is directed to a center feed roll having a center unwinding first strip forming a projection. This projection extends from the center opening to facilitate withdrawal of the first sheet even after total collapse of the center opening. A partially collapsed center-opening having such a projection is clearly illustrated in FIG. 2. The Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the partial collapse in FIG. 2 can progress to a total collapse resulting in the center-opening being substantially flat as presented in claim 54. Accordingly, the Applicant further respectfully submits that the specification, as originally filed, supports the proposition that the center-opening can be reduced until substantially flat such that the limitations presented in claim 54 do not constitute new matter.

Objections to the Drawings

Also on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings submitted with the application as failing to show each and every feature of the claims. The Examiner argues that the figures fail to show a roll having a center opening being collapsed (Claim 52); a center

opening being reduced (claim 53); and a center opening being reduced until substantially flat (claim 54). The Applicant respectfully submits that FIGs. 2, 2A, and 2B show a roll having a center opening that is collapsed/reduced. This interpretation is clearly supported in the description of FIG. 2 in the specification as originally submitted as well as on page 11, line 25 through page 12, line 1. The Applicant further submits that the limitation requiring that the center opening be reduced until substantially flat is clearly shown in FIG. 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the partial collapse in FIG. 2 can progress to a total collapse resulting in the center-opening being substantially flat as presented in claim 54.

§112 Rejections

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 52 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner argues that claims 52 and 53 contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 52 requires that the roll have a center opening being collapsed and claim 53 requires that the roll have a center opening being reduced. The Applicant respectfully submits that at least FIG. 2, the description of FIG. 2 on page 10, and page 11, line 25 through page 12, line 1 describe a reduced/collapses center opening, thereby clearly demonstrating that the inventors had possession of the invention at the time the application was filed.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 54 requires that the center opening of the roll be reduced until substantially flat. The Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize from the discussion on page 3, line 16 through page 4, line 4 and the partial collapse illustrated in FIG. 2, which, as discussed above, can progress to a total collapse resulting in the center-opening being substantially flat, that the inventors had possession of the invention at the time the application was filed.

Obviousness Rejections

On page 4 through page 9 the Examiner outlines a series of obviousness rejections of the pending claims. More specifically, claims 26-31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morand (U.S. Patent No. 5,577,634); claims 26-27, 29, and 32-35 are rejected as being unpatentable over Larsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,760,970); claims 52-54 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morand in view of Applicant's disclosure on page 3, lines 16-21, page 4, lines 5-10, page 11 lines 16-19 and Figure 1; and claims 52-54 are rejected as being unpatentable over Larsson in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In general, the present invention, as defined by claim 26, the only independent claim at issue, requires a roll without a winding tube comprising one sheet of non-moist flexible material **formed** by rolling the sheet around a winding axis, with a center unwinding first strip forming a projection along said axis in relation to at least one part of at least one side of the roll, said roll being wrapped in flexible packaging. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 requires that the roll be formed with a center unwinding first strip forming a projection. The projection enables a user to start unwinding the roll even after the center opening has been reduced or collapsed.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. In rejecting the claims of the present invention, the Examiner relies upon Morand and/or Larsson. Morand is directed to a paper towel dispenser for dispensing toweling from inside diameter of a roll. The roll illustrated in Morand is a type well known in the art and described by the Application in the Background of the present application. The roll is of a center pull type that is started by grasping and withdrawing a first sheet from a center opening. The roll is not **formed** with the first sheet forming a projection as required by claim 26. Similarly, Larsson is directed to a feeding out device for a material web withdrawable from a roll. The feeding out device likewise employs rolls of a type known in the art and described by the Applicant in the Background of the present invention. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as none of the prior art relied upon in rejecting the claims of the present invention teaches or

suggest a roll formed having a center projection. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejections and pass the application to allowance.

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined over the prior art such that allowance of all claims and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any additional questions or concerns regarding this matter, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorneys

By /Victor Kernus/
Victor Kernus
Registration No. 50,146
Customer No. 31743
Cantor Colburn LLP
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-236-4500
Fax: 703-236-4501

Date: September 17, 2009